

YW



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/480,013	01/10/2000	SHARAT SUBRAMANIYAM CHANDER	CHANDER6-5	3803
------------	------------	-----------------------------	------------	------

44190	7590	02/09/2005
-------	------	------------

WALTER W. DUFT
 LAW OFFICES OF WALTER W. DUFT
 8616 MAIN ST
 SUITE 2
 WILLIAMSVILLE, NY 14221

EXAMINER

CRAVER, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2682

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/480,013

Applicant(s)

CHANDER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles R Craver

Art Unit

2682

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 10-25-04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertion that Hansson in view of Hult and Ross fails to render obvious the instant invention of e.g. amended claim 1. As to the provision of the teleservice payload size to the entity directly serving the MS, Hult suggests such a system as improving bandwidth usage; the use of messaging from a database to said entity is taught by Ross with an emphasis on eliminating extra steps in the messaging system. Note that Hult discloses that the indication of maximum teleservice message size is received from another entity in the system in col 3 line 66-col 4 line 13, where it is stated that the indicator of the maximum size (load) is determined at one entity and used in another entity of the network for formatting messages. As stated in applicant's arguments, the MSC uses the information. However, the information is used, as stated above, for limiting the size of messages in the same manner as Hansson. As such, the combined invention contemplates a payload system where the indication of payload is received at a serving entity from another portion of the network, and standard messages are used to convey the data; such would be an obvious combination, given the scope of standard messaging at the time of the invention in the art, and the small amount of data used to convey said payload size.

Art Unit: 2682

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 for both formal and informal/draft communications, labeled as such.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Plaza II, 200 South 20th St, Arlington VA, first floor.

Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Charles Craver at (703) 305-3965.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin, can be reached at (703) 308-6739.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-4700.

CC

C.Craver

January 28, 2005


CHARLES CRAVER
PRIMARY EXAMINER